

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
01/07/2002	Yun Lung Chen	2323	9457
0 11/17/2003	EXAMINER		INER
WEI TE CHUNG		CHANG, YEAN HSI	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1650 MEMOREX DRIVE SANTA CLARA, CA 95050			
	01/07/2002 0 11/17/2003 NG ERNATIONAL, INC. X DRIVE	01/07/2002 Yun Lung Chen  11/17/2003 IG ERNATIONAL, INC. X DRIVE	01/07/2002 Yun Lung Chen 2323  0 11/17/2003 EXAM  IG CHANG, Y  ERNATIONAL, INC.  X DRIVE ART UNIT

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

_	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/038,443	CHEN, YUN LUNG			
Office Action Summary	Examin r	Art Unit			
	Yean-Hsi Chang	2835 UW			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute,  - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS for cause the application to become ABANDO	timely filed days will be considered timely. om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 Ju	<u>ıly 2003</u> .				
2a)⊠ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)☐ This	2b)☐ This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	<u> </u>				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic since a specific reference was included in the first 37 CFR 1.78.  a) The translation of the foreign language pro 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic reference was included in the first sentence of the	s have been received. s have been received in Applicative documents have been received in (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). of the certified copies not receive priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11st sentence of the specification visional application has been received.	ation No ived in this National Stage  ved. 0(e) (to a provisional application) or in an Application Data Sheet. eceived. 20 and/or 121 since a specific			
Attachment(s)		(070.440) D			
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)     Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)     Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informa	ry (PTO-413) Paper No(s) I Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/038,443

Art Unit: 2835

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Page 2

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 2. Claims 1-13 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,313 B1 (Pat.'313) in view of Justice et al. (US 6,299,266 B1), further in view of Adams et al. (US 6,330,147 B1). The differences between the content of the claims the instant application and the content of claims of Pat. '313 are as follows:
- A. The terminologies used are different, such as: a mounting assembly vs. a fastening device, a storage device vs. a data storage device, a mounting bracket vs. a bracket, a first side panel vs. a second side panel, a second side panel vs. first side panel, and etc.
  - B. Pat. '313 fails to claim a clip detachably attached on the second side panel, comprising a central press portion and a pair of hands, each of the hands

Application/Control Number: 10/038,443 Page 3

Art Unit: 2835

having a palm extendable through a corresponding through hole of the mounting bracket.

Justice teaches mounting assembly (200, fig. 2) comprising: a clip (220, fig. 2) detachably attached (screw fastened may be considered as detachably attached) on a second side panel (210, fig. 2), comprising a central press portion (330, fig. 3) and a pair of hands (240, fig. 3b), each having a palm (not numbered, shown at end of 240 in fig. 3) extending through a corresponding through hole (310, fig. 3) of the mounting bracket.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Pat.'313 with the clip taught by Justice so that the storage device can be firmly held in place.

Also, regarding "detachably attached" feature of the clip, It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the clip of Justice detachably attached, since it has been held that constructing a formally integral structure in various elements involves only routine skill in the art. See MPEP §2144.04, V C.

C. Pat.'313 modified by Justice fails to teach barbs on each palm.

Adams teaches barbs (26, fig. 2) on each palm (24 and 25, fig. 2) of an arm (21 and 23, fig. 2) of a clip (20, fig. 2) on a mounting bracket (14, fig. 1).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Pat.'313 modified by Justice

Application/Control Number: 10/038,443 Page 4

Art Unit: 2835

with the palm taught by Adams such that the palm can be resiliently engaged with the storage device.

## Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

# Correspondence

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yean-Hsi Chang whose telephone number is (703) 306-5798. The examiner can normally be reached on 07:30-16:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Darren Schuberg can be reached on (703) 308-4815. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3431 for regular communications and for After Final communications. There are RightFAX numbers and provide the fax sender with an auto-reply fax verifying receipt by the USPTO: Before-Final (703-872-9318) and After-Final (703-872-9319).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-8558.

Yean-Hsi Chang Patent Examiner Art Unit: 2835 November 9, 2003

DARREN SCHUBERG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800